



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,125	11/01/2000	Hitoshi Miyasaka	EITCP003HO	4127

20178 7590 06/16/2005

EPSON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INC  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT  
150 RIVER OAKS PARKWAY, SUITE 225  
SAN JOSE, CA 95134

EXAMINER

CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/705,125

Applicant(s)

MIYASAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Joshua D Campbell

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 31-34 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 35-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 04/06/2005.
2. Claims 31-40 are pending in this case. Claims 31, 35, and 37 are independent claims. Claims 31 and 37 have been amended.
3. The rejection of claims 31-34 and 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter has been withdrawn due to amendments.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 31-34 are allowed.
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding added independent claim 31, none of the references, either singularly or in combination, teach or suggest to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention the amended features, "...applying a first mapping to obtain a first indication of categories that represents the one or more preferred categories in a form that conforms to a first hierarchical structure comprising topics, wherein the first mapping specifies a transformation between the topics and the subtopics in the base hierarchical structure to the topics in the first hierarchical structure... generating a first search requirements in response to the first indication of categories and using the first search requirements... applying a second mapping to obtain a second indication of

categories that represents the one or more preferred categories in a form that conforms to a second hierarchical structure comprising topics, wherein the second mapping specifies a transformation between the topics and the subtopics in the base hierarchical structure to the topics in the second hierarchical structure... generating a second search requirements in response to the second indication of categories and using the second search requirements...” The examiner notes that while creating a personalized presentation of news based on user preferences is not a novel feature (See Examiner Referenced Patents), in combination with the other limitations of the method steps and system functions of the independent claim (i.e. applying a first mapping to obtain a first indication of categories that represents the one or more preferred categories in a form that conforms to a first hierarchical structure comprising topics, wherein the first mapping specifies a transformation between the topics and the subtopics in the base hierarchical structure to the topics in the first hierarchical structure; generating a first search requirements in response to the first indication of categories and using the first search requirements; applying a second mapping to obtain a second indication of categories that represents the one or more preferred categories in a form that conforms to a second hierarchical structure comprising topics, wherein the second mapping specifies a transformation between the topics and the subtopics in the base hierarchical structure to the topics in the second hierarchical structure; generating a second search requirements in response to the second indication of categories and using the second search requirements) the limitations of claim 31 are considered novel, and unobvious to

a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the prior art of record.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 35 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nehab et al. (hereinafter Nehab, US Patent Number 6,029,182, issued on February 22, 2000).

**Regarding independent claim 35**, Nehab discloses a method in which a user generates a profile containing information including layout, sites to check, keywords, and types of articles to be used to create a personalized newspaper (column 9, 4-61 of Nehab). This profile is obtained and used to find (identify) documents and articles that fit into the user preferences (relevance based on keywords, type of article, topic of article, etc.) (column 8, line 10-column 9, line 61 of Nehab). Nehab discloses a method in which the articles that are deemed relevant based on the user profile are presented (generating a list) to the user and a format editor gives the user the ability to decide

Art Unit: 2179

which articles are to be place in the newspaper and how they are to be laid out in the template (column 9, line 4-column 10, line 6 of Nehab). The articles that have been obtained because they were deemed relevant are then placed into a template based on the user's specification of layout (column 9, line 4-column 10, line 6 of Nehab). The articles can be generated corresponding to a layout that is to be printed via a print device and/or corresponding to a layout that is to be displayed via a display device (column 9, line 4-column 10, line 6 and column 10, lines 21-35 and column 13, line 39-column 15, line 12 of Nehab). Both presentations are delivered when finished (column 9, line 4-column 10, line 6 and column 10, lines 21-35 of Nehab).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 36-40 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab et al. (hereinafter Nehab, US Patent Number 6,029,182, issued on February 22, 2000) as applied to claims 1, 10, and 19 above, and further in view of Ferguson (IDS, US Patent Number 5,649,186, issued on July 15, 1997).

**Regarding dependent claim 36,** Nehab discloses a method in which the articles that are deemed relevant based on the user profile are presented (generating a list) to the user and a format editor gives the user the ability to decide which articles are to be place in the newspaper and how they are to be laid out in the template (column 9, line 4-column 10, line 6 of Nehab). The articles that have been obtained because they were deemed relevant are then listed in a template based on the user's specification of layout (column 9, line 4-column 10, line 6 of Nehab). Nehab does not disclose a method in which a direct indication of selected entries from the list of entries by the user is received. However, Ferguson discloses a method in which a list of topically organized articles is presented to a user and the user makes selections from that list to be included in the user's customized newspaper (column 4, lines 6-60 of Ferguson). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Nehab and Ferguson because it would have allowed the user to have complete control over specific content.

**Regarding independent claim 37**, Nehab discloses a method in which a user generates a profile containing information including layout, sites to check, keywords, and types of articles to be used to create a personalized newspaper (column 9, 4-61 of Nehab). This profile is obtained and used to find (identify) documents and articles that fit into the user preferences (relevance based on keywords, type of article, topic of article, etc.) (column 8, line 10-column 9, line 61 of Nehab). Nehab discloses a method in which the articles that are deemed relevant based on the user profile are presented (generating a list) to the user and a format editor gives the user the ability to decide which articles are to be place in the newspaper and how they are to be laid out in the template (column 9, line 4-column 10, line 6 of Nehab). The articles that have been obtained because they were deemed relevant are then placed into a template based on the user's specification of layout (column 9, line 4-column 10, line 6 of Nehab). Nehab does not disclose a method in which a direct indication of a measure of interest of a user is received. However, Ferguson discloses a method in which a list of topically organized articles is presented to a user and the user makes a judgment on whether or not to include the article (measure of interest) (column 4, lines 6-60 of Ferguson).. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Nehab and Ferguson because it would have allowed the user to have complete control over specific content.

**Regarding dependent claims 38 and 39**, Nehab does not disclose a method in which a direct indication of a measure of interest of a user is received for either articles that are already contained in the newspaper or articles that have been omitted.



However, Ferguson discloses a method in which a list of topically organized articles is presented to a user, which includes all articles already chosen for the newspaper and omitted from the newspaper, and the user makes a judgment on whether or not to include the article (measure of interest) (column 4, lines 6-60 of Ferguson). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Nehab and Ferguson because it would have allowed the user to have complete control over specific content.

**Regarding dependent claim 40,** Nehab discloses a method in which the articles that are deemed relevant based on the user profile are presented (generating a list) to the user and a format editor gives the user the ability to decide which articles are to be place in the newspaper and how they are to be laid out in the template (column 9, line 4-column 10, line 6 of Nehab). The articles that have been obtained because they were deemed relevant are then listed in a template based on the user's specification of layout (column 9, line 4-column 10, line 6 of Nehab). Nehab does not disclose a method in which a direct indication of selected entries from the list of entries by the user is received. However, Ferguson discloses a method in which a list of topically organized articles is presented to a user and the user makes selections from that list to be included in the user's customized newspaper (column 4, lines 6-60 of Ferguson). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Nehab and Ferguson because it would have allowed the user to have complete control over specific content.

***Response to Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments filed 04/06/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the arguments on pages 6-7 regarding independent claim 35, and the limitations referred to by the applicant as limitations "(c) to (f)," the examiner maintains that the Nehab reference teaches the limitations as presented in the claims. Regarding limitation "(c)" ("...obtaining content information that represents at least part of the content of at least some of the plurality of documents and obtaining summary information that summarizes the content represented in the content information...") Nehab shows in the section cited in the rejection (specifically column 9, lines 17-24) that part of the content (the pages themselves) of at least some of the documents (data retrieved from the web) is downloaded, then from the document summary information (the specific articles contained within the page, rather than the entire page with all of the articles together, also the titles which summarize each and every article are obtained as separate entities from the articles and full document (Figures 3C and 3D) is obtained which inherently provides a more condensed representation of what the page in its entirety deals with. As shown in Nehab (column 10, lines 21-36), the newspaper itself may be set to print at a certain time, the details of an interface in Nehab are shown in column 13, line 39-column 15, line 12 and Figures 9A and 9B. A content page for printing is generated and a preview to be displayed on the screen is also generated which is shown to include headings (Figure 9A, item 61). The preview provides a condensed form (summary) of how the articles will be presented (column 15, lines 7-12

of Nehab). At any time the print button can be used to print the full content version of the document (column 13, lines 56-65 of Nehab). The functionality of this interface clarifies the general functionality, as it would be applied in a GUI. Thus, it is maintained that Nehab teaches the claimed limitations and the rejection stands.

Regarding the arguments on pages 7-8, regarding independent claim 37 and the limitation "...receiving from the recipient a measure of recipient interest in the content information and, in response, revising the profile to reflect the changes in recipient preferences...", the examiner maintains that the Ferguson reference teaches this limitation and that motivation to combine it with the Nehab reference exists. Ferguson states in the cited section (column 4, lines 42-52) the user has access to "Save" "Edit" and "Delete" buttons in the GUI for the application. It is not explicitly stated by Ferguson what these buttons do, however in a rather reasonable manner, Ferguson states that the common function of the buttons would be apparent to someone of skill in the art. Thus one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that "Edit" would be used to allow a user to make changes to a profile that was already used to create a newspaper, and "Delete" would be a function that would provide a user with the ability to remove items from a profile. Thus, based on the notoriously well-known functions "Edit" and "Delete" the limitation in question is in fact taught by Ferguson, thus the rejection stands.

### ***Conclusion***

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/705,125  
Art Unit: 2179

Page 12

JDC  
June 3, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sanjiv Shah', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**SANJIV SHAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**